UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/601,832	06/24/2003	Michael Werth	ATOCM-332	9062

23599 7590 01/11/2008

MILLEN, WHITE, ZELANO & BRANIGAN, P.C.
2200 CLARENDON BLVD.
SUITE 1400
ARLINGTON, VA 22201

EXAMINER	
AUGHENBAUGH, WALTER	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
1794	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
01/11/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/601,832	WERTH, MICHAEL	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Walter B. Aughenbaugh	1794	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *30 October 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,4-9,11 and 13-21* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *8 and 19* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,4-7,9,11,13-18,20 and 21* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/ are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on October 30, 2007 has been entered.

Acknowledgement of Applicant's Amendments

2. The amendments made in claims 2, 4, 9 and 11 in the Amendment filed October 30, 2007 (Amdt. F) have been received and considered by Examiner.

3. New claims 20 and 21 presented in Amdt. F have been received and considered by Examiner.

4. Applicant's cancellation of claim 3 in Amdt. F has been acknowledged by Examiner.

WITHDRAWN OBJECTION

5. The objection to claims 2 and 9 made of record in paragraph 6 of previous Office Action mailed August 10, 2007 has been withdrawn due to Applicant's amendments in claims 2 and 9 in Amdt. F.

WITHDRAWN REJECTIONS

6. The 35 U.S.C. 112 rejection of claim 2 that was repeated in paragraph 5 of previous Office Action mailed August 10, 2007 has been withdrawn due to Applicant's amendments in claim 2 in Amdt. F.

7. The 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection of claims 2, 3, 11, 13 and 14 made of record in paragraph 8 of previous Office Action mailed August 10, 2007 has been withdrawn due to Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection (and due to Applicant's cancellation of claim 3).

8. The 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection of claims 4, 5, 15 and 16 made of record in paragraph 9 of previous Office Action mailed August 10, 2007 has been withdrawn due to the withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection of claims 2, 13 and 14 made of record in paragraph 8 of previous Office Action mailed August 10, 2007 for the reason provided above in this Office Action.

REPEATED REJECTIONS

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection of claims 1 and 9 made of record in paragraph 8 of previous Office Action mailed August 10, 2007 has been repeated for the reasons previously made of record.

10. The 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection of claim 6 made of record in paragraph 10 of previous Office Action mailed August 10, 2007 has been repeated for the reasons previously made of record.

11. The 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection of claim 7 made of record in paragraph 11 of previous Office Action mailed August 10, 2007 has been repeated for the reasons previously made of record.

NEW REJECTIONS

12. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

13. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the

invention. The language of claim 6 makes it unclear whether or not Applicant intends to recite the "tie layer" of claim 6 as a separate layer from the optional "coextrusion tie layer" of claim 1. If Applicant intends to recite the "tie layer" of claim 6 as the same layer as the optional "coextrusion tie layer" of claim 1, Applicant should amend the claim to recite "the coextrusion tie layer" (or similar recitation). If Applicant intends to recite the "tie layer" of claim 6 as a separate layer from the optional "coextrusion tie layer" of claim 1, this recitation falls outside the scope delineated by claim 1, since claim 1 requires that the pipe consist of the recited layers (but makes the "coextrusion tie layer" optional).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

14. Claims 13, 14, 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Heilmann et al. (USPN 6,004,311).

In regard to claims 13, 14 and 21, Heilmann et al. teach the claimed pipe where the inner layer (layer 2a) comprises a copolymer having polyamide blocks and polyether blocks, where layers 2a and 2b comprise either, solely a copolymer having polyamide blocks and polyether blocks, or a blend of a copolymer having polyamide blocks and polyether blocks and polyethylene copolymers, both of which are thermoplastic polymers (col. 12, lines 26-43, particularly lines 38-41, and col. 10, lines 28-41). The base layer of Heilmann et al. (layer 4, col. 12, lines 41-43), which comprises a polyethylene copolymer, corresponds to the claimed polyolefin layer (col. 10, lines 28-41). Layer 2b of Heilmann et al. corresponds to the claimed outer layer , where the layer 2b comprises either, solely a copolymer having polyamide blocks and polyether blocks, or a blend of a copolymer having polyamide blocks and polyether blocks

and polyethylene copolymers, both of which are thermoplastic polymers (col. 12, lines 26-43, particularly lines 38-41, and col. 10, lines 28-41).

In regard to claim 20, Heilmann et al. teach the claimed pipe where the inner layer (layer 2a) comprises a copolymer having polyamide blocks and polyether blocks, where layers 2a and 2b comprise a blend of a copolymer having polyamide blocks and polyether blocks and polyethylene copolymers (col. 12, lines 26-43, particularly lines 38-41).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

15. Claims 2, 11, 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Quigley et al. (USPN 6,357,485) in view of Flepp et al. (USPN 6,555,243).

In regard to claim 2, Quigley et al. teach an offshore flexible pipe (item 10, col. 1, lines 20-42 and col. 16, line 51-col. 17, line 13) consisting of an unsealed metal flexible inner layer (liner, item 12, col. 8, lines 51-62, Fig. 8: Quigley et al. teach that the unsealed flexible inner layer [liner, item 12, col. 8, lines 51-62] comprises a wound [coiled] metal strip [col. 8, lines 43-53 and col. 1, lines 20-27]) and outer sealing layers, in which the outer sealing layers are, in succession: an inner layer formed from at least one thermoplastic polymer comprising a polyamide (composite layer, item 14, which comprises fiber and a matrix, where nylon, which is polyamide, is a suitable material for both the fibers and the matrix, where a thermoplastic material is a suitable material for the fibers, col. 10, lines 3-12, 31-39 and 62-67 and col. 11, lines 3-8, and Fig. 8, and where aramid, which is also polyamide, is also a suitable material for the fiber (col. 10, lines 62-67 and Fig. 8)), a polyolefin layer, item 58, where suitable materials for the polyolefin layer are polyethylene and polypropylene, both of which are polyolefins (col. 15, lines 38-44 and Fig. 8), and, outside the polyolefin layer, item 58, an outer layer formed from

at least one thermoplastic polymer (item 14', col. 16, lines 51-67, col. 10, lines 3-12, 31-39 and 62-67 and col. 11, lines 3-8 and Fig. 8). Since Quigley et al. teach that the layers 14 and 14' need not be identical (col. 16, lines 51-67), Quigley et al. teach that the layers 14 and 14' may be identical: in the instance where the inner layer 14 comprises polyamide, as discussed above, and the layers 14 and 14' are identical, the outer layer 14' comprises polyamide.

Quigley et al. fail to explicitly teach that the material of the inner layer (composite layer, item 14) of the sealing layers is a blend of a polyamide and a polyolefin having a polyamide matrix.

Flepp et al., however, disclose a multilayer pipe (col. 1, lines 6-9 and col. 5, lines 18-36) comprising an inner layer comprising a blend of a polyamide and a polyolefin having a polyamide matrix (the adhesion-promoting layer of Flepp et al. that is made from a mixture of a polyamide and a compatibilizer is a layer comprising a blend of a polyamide and a polyolefin having a polyamide matrix since the compatibilizer is a polyolefin, col. 5, lines 28-29 and col. 6, lines 50-57). Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized to have used the blend of a polyamide and a polyolefin having a polyamide matrix taught by Flepp et al. as the mixture of the inner layer since a blend of a polyamide and a polyolefin having a polyamide matrix is a well known adhesion-promoting material for use as the material of an inner layer of a multilayer hose as taught by Flepp et al.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used the blend of a polyamide and a polyolefin having a polyamide matrix taught by Flepp et al. as the mixture of the inner layer since a blend of a polyamide and a

polyolefin having a polyamide matrix is a well known adhesion-promoting material for use as the material of an inner layer of a multilayer hose as taught by Flepp et al.

In regard to claim 11, Quigley et al. teach an offshore flexible pipe (item 10, col. 1, lines 20-42 and col. 8, lines 43-50) consisting of sealing layers, in succession: an inner layer formed from at least one thermoplastic polymer (liner, item 12), where thermoplastics such as polyamide, polyethylene and polypropylene are suitable materials for the inner layer (col. 8, line 51-62, col. 8, line 65-col. 9, line 14 and Fig. 4) and where the inner layer would be in contact with the fluid being transported in the pipe if fluid were being transported in the pipe (Fig. 4 and col. 8, lines 43-53), a coextrusion tie layer (item 56, col. 14, lines 3-9 and 29-41, col. 17, lines 39-50 [which discloses that the pipe can be formed of coextruded polymers] and Fig. 4) and a polyolefin layer (composite layer, item 14, Fig. 4), where suitable materials for the composite layer are polyethylene and polypropylene (col. 10, lines 31-38 and col. 11, lines 3-7).

Quigley et al. fail to explicitly teach that the material of the inner layer (liner, item 12) of the sealing layers is a blend of a polyamide and a polyolefin having a polyamide matrix or any of the other materials recited in claim 11.

Flepp et al., however, disclose a multilayer pipe (col. 1, lines 6-9 and col. 5, lines 18-36) comprising an inner layer comprising a blend of a polyamide and a polyolefin having a polyamide matrix (inner layer comprising polyamide and an acid modified ethylene-alpha olefin copolymer impact strength modifier, col. 5, lines 18-36 and col. 6, lines 33-43 and 50-57, where the polyamide blended with an impact strength modifier corresponds to a blend of a polyamide and a polyolefin having a polyamide matrix). Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized to have used the blend of a polyamide and a polyolefin having a polyamide

matrix taught by Flepp et al. as the polyamide of the inner layer of Quigley et al. since a blend of a polyamide and a polyolefin having a polyamide matrix is a well known material for use as the material of an inner layer of a multilayer hose as taught by Flepp et al.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used the blend of a polyamide and a polyolefin having a polyamide matrix taught by Flepp et al. as the polyamide of the inner layer of Quigley et al. since a blend of a polyamide and a polyolefin having a polyamide matrix is a well known material for use as the material of an inner layer of a multilayer hose as taught by Flepp et al.

In regard to claim 13, Quigley et al. teach an offshore flexible pipe (item 10, col. 1, lines 20-42 and col. 8, lines 43-50) consisting of sealing layers, in succession: an inner layer formed from at least one thermoplastic polymer (liner, item 12), where thermoplastics such as polyamide, polyethylene and polypropylene are suitable materials for the inner layer (col. 8, line 51-62, col. 8, line 65-col. 9, line 14 and Fig. 5) and where the inner layer would be in contact with the fluid being transported in the pipe if fluid were being transported in the pipe (Fig. 5 and col. 8, lines 43-53), a coextrusion tie layer (item 56, col. 14, lines 3-9 and 29-41, col. 17, lines 39-50 [which discloses that the pipe can be formed of coextruded polymers] and Fig. 5), a polyolefin layer (composite layer, item 14, Fig. 5), where suitable materials for the composite layer are polyethylene and polypropylene (col. 10, lines 31-38 and col. 11, lines 3-7), and an outer layer formed from at least one thermoplastic polymer (barrier layer, item 58) where suitable materials for the thermoplastic layer are thermoplastics such as polyethylene and polypropylene (col. 15, lines 38-44 and Fig. 5) the embodiment where inner layer (liner, item 12) and outer layer (barrier layer, item 58) are of different thermoplastic polymers, as recited by

identification of the polymer of the inner layer as polymer (A) and by identification of the polymer of the outer layer as polymer (B) in Applicant's claims, falls within the scope of the teachings of Quigley et al. since inner layer (liner, item 12) and outer layer (barrier layer, item 58) are disclosed as separate layers that can comprise one of a plurality of thermoplastic polymers (col. 8, line 51-62, col. 8, line 65-col. 9, line 14 and (col. 15, lines 38-44).

Quigley et al. fail to explicitly teach that the material of the inner layer (liner, item 12) of the sealing layers is a blend of a polyamide and a polyolefin having a polyamide matrix or any of the other materials recited in claim 13.

Flepp et al., however, disclose a multilayer pipe (col. 1, lines 6-9 and col. 5, lines 18-36) comprising an inner layer comprising a blend of a polyamide and a polyolefin having a polyamide matrix (inner layer comprising polyamide and an acid modified ethylene-alpha olefin copolymer impact strength modifier, col. 5, lines 18-36 and col. 6, lines 33-43 and 50-57, where the polyamide blended with an impact strength modifier corresponds to a blend of a polyamide and a polyolefin having a polyamide matrix). Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized to have used the blend of a polyamide and a polyolefin having a polyamide matrix taught by Flepp et al. as the polyamide of the inner layer of Quigley et al. since a blend of a polyamide and a polyolefin having a polyamide matrix is a well known material for use as the material of an inner layer of a multilayer hose as taught by Flepp et al.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used the blend of a polyamide and a polyolefin having a polyamide matrix taught by Flepp et al. as the polyamide of the inner layer of Quigley et al. since a blend of a

polyamide and a polyolefin having a polyamide matrix is a well known material for use as the material of an inner layer of a multilayer hose as taught by Flepp et al.

In regard to claim 14, Quigley et al. teach that thermoplastics such as polyamide are suitable materials for the outer layer (barrier layer, item 58) (col. 15, lines 38-44).

16. Claims 4, 5, 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Quigley et al. (USPN 6,357,485) in view of Flepp et al. (USPN 6,555,243) and in further view of Strassel et al. (USPN 5,601,893).

Quigley et al. and Flepp et al. teach the pipe as discussed above in regard to claims 2 and 14.

In regard to claims 4 and 15, Quigley et al. and Flepp et al. fail to explicitly teach that the polymers (A) and (B) are one of the polymers listed in claim 4.

Strassel et al., however, disclose a multilayered offshore flexible pipe (col. 1, lines 15-21 and col. 2, lines 55-63) that offers significant mechanical resistance especially to internal pressure thus permitting use of the pipe in offshore oil and gas production (col. 1, lines 15-21). Strassel et al. teach that polyamide is a suitable polymer for the outer layer, item 9, of the sheath (col. 5, lines 12-24) and specifically teach polyamide-11 (PA-11) as the polyamide of the outer layer, item 9 (col. 13, lines 20-40). Strassel et al. also teach that PA-11 does not blister or inflate when in contact with live crude and that plasticized PA-11 is leak-proof when used as the sheath material for flexible metal pipes (col. 2, lines 13-16 and 28-31). Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized to have used PA-11 as polyamides (A) and (B) of the pipe of Quigley et al. and Flepp et al. since PA-11 is a well known polyamide for use as the material of layers in a multilayered offshore flexible pipe that offers significant mechanical resistance

especially to internal pressure thus permitting use of the pipe in offshore oil and gas production due to the fact that PA-11 does not blister or inflate when in contact with live crude and that plasticized PA-11 is leak-proof when used as the sheath material for flexible metal pipes as taught by Strassel et al.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used PA-11 as polyamides (A) and (B) of the pipe of Quigley et al. and Flepp et al. since PA-11 is a well known polyamide for use as the material of layers in a multilayered offshore flexible pipe that offers significant mechanical resistance especially to internal pressure thus permitting use of the pipe in offshore oil and gas production due to the fact that PA-11 does not blister or inflate when in contact with live crude and that plasticized PA-11 is leak-proof when used as the sheath material for flexible metal pipes as taught by Strassel et al.

In regard to claims 5 and 16, Quigley et al., Flepp et al. and Strassel et al. teach the pipe as discussed above in regard to claims 4 and 15.

Quigley et al., Flepp et al. and Strassel et al. fail to explicitly teach that the pipe of Quigley et al. and Flepp et al., or the PA-11 of Strassel et al., contains a plasticizer.

Strassel et al., however, teach that plasticized PA-11 is leak-proof when used as the sheath material for flexible metal pipes (col. 2, lines 28-31). Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized to have added a plasticizer to the PA-11 of the pipe taught by Quigley et al., Flepp et al. and Strassel et al. in order to render the pipe leak-proof when used as the sheath material for flexible metal pipes for use in oil or gas extraction as taught by Strassel et al.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have added a plasticizer to the PA-11 of the pipe taught by Quigley et al., Flepp et al. and Strassel et al. in order to render the pipe leak-proof when used as the sheath material for flexible metal pipes for use in oil or gas extraction as taught by Strassel et al.

17. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Quigley et al. (USPN 6,357,485) in view of Flepp et al. (USPN 6,555,243) and in further view of Roeber et al. (USPN 5,858,492).

Quigley et al. and Flepp et al. teach the pipe as discussed above in regard to claim 11.

Quigley et al. and Flepp et al. fail to teach that the tie layer is a functionalized polyolefin carrying a carboxylic acid or carboxylic acid anhydride functional group.

Roeber et al., however, disclose a coupling (equivalently, tie) layer that couples a layer comprising a polyolefin molding composition layer to a layer comprising polyamide (col. 10, lines 41-54). Roeber et al. disclose that a suitable polymer for the coupling layer is a functionalized polyolefin carrying a carboxylic acid or carboxylic acid anhydride functional group (col. 5, lines 7-22 and 28-33) and that the coupling layer firmly bonds the polyolefin molding composition layer and the polyamide layer together (col. 10, line 54). Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized to have formed the pipe of Quigley et al. and Flepp et al. such the tie layer is a functionalized polyolefin carrying a carboxylic acid or carboxylic acid anhydride functional group of Roeber et al. that is located between the polyolefin layer and polyamide inner layer in order to firmly bond the polyolefin layer and polyamide inner layer together as taught by Roeber et al.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have formed the pipe of Quigley et al. and Flepp et al. such the tie layer is a functionalized polyolefin carrying a carboxylic acid or carboxylic acid anhydride functional group of Roeber et al. that is located between the polyolefin layer and polyamide inner layer in order to firmly bond the polyolefin layer and polyamide inner layer together as taught by Roeber et al.

18. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Quigley et al. (USPN 6,357,485) in view of Flepp et al. (USPN 6,555,243) and in further view of Hill.

Quigley et al. and Flepp et al. teach the pipe as discussed above in regard to claim 11. Quigley et al. teach polyethylene as a suitable material of the polyolefin layer.

Quigley et al. and Flepp et al. fail to explicitly teach that the polyethylene is high density polyethylene.

Hill, however, discloses a multilayer pipe that is used to carry petroleum or oil (col. 1, lines 1-10) that consists of a layer of high density polyethylene that is directly bonded to a layer of polyamide (col. 5, lines 36-40). Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized to have used high density polyethylene as the polyethylene of the polyolefin layer of Quigley et al. and Flepp et al. since high density polyethylene is a known suitable material for use in a layer of a multilayer pipe that is used to carry petroleum or oil as taught by Hill.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used high density polyethylene as the polyethylene of the polyolefin layer of Quigley et al. and Flepp et al. since high density polyethylene is a known suitable material for use in a layer of a multilayer pipe that is used to carry petroleum or oil as taught by Hill.

Response to Arguments

19. Applicant's arguments presented on pages 7-8 of Amdt. F regarding the 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection of claims 2, 3, 11, 13 and 14 are moot due to the withdrawal of this rejection in this Office Action for the reason provided above.

20. Applicant's arguments presented on pages 7-8 of Amdt. F regarding the 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection of claims 1 and 9 have been fully considered but are not persuasive.

In the sentence bridging pages 7 and 8 of Amdt. F, Applicant mischaracterizes that which is stated in the Office Action. The Office Action states that

> [o]ne of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized to have used the blend of a polyamide and a polyolefin having a polyamide matrix taught by Flepp et al. as the mixture of the inner layer since a blend of a polyamide and a polyolefin having a polyamide matrix is a well known adhesion-promoting material for use as the material of an inner layer of a multilayer hose as taught by Flepp et al.

Page 5 of previous Office Action mailed August 10, 2007. The Office Action does not characterize the adhesion-promoting material as "quite known" (contrary to Applicant's characterization), and the material of the layer taught by Flepp, not the layer itself, is proposed in the Office Action to be replaced with the material of the inner layer of Quigley.

Since Flepp teaches that a layer comprising metal can be added to the inside surface of the four layer tube (and would thus be bonded to the polyamide inner layer (a), col. 6, lines 13-21), one of ordinary skill in the art would have expected the blend of Flepp at issue in the rejection of record to bond to a metal layer. Since the compatibilizer that is relied upon in the rejection of record is a polyolefin, one of ordinary skill in the art would have expected the blend of Flepp at issue in the rejection of record to bond to a polyolefin layer, since a polymeric material (e.g. the nylon of Flepp) that can be blended with another polymeric material (e.g. the

polyolefin of Flepp) has a certain degree of affinity or compatibility (as opposed to incompatibility) for that other polymeric material.

21. Applicant's arguments presented on page 9 of Amdt. F regarding the remainder of the 35 U.S.C. 103 rejections have been fully considered but are not persuasive. Applicant's arguments here depend upon Applicant's arguments regarding claims 1 and 9, which have been addressed above.

Conclusion

22. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Walter B. Aughenbaugh whose telephone number is (571) 272-1488. While the examiner sets his work schedule under the Increased Flexitime Policy, he can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:45am to 5:15pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Terrel Morris, can be reached on (571) 272-1478. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Walter B. Aughenbaugh
12/31/07

Walter B Aughenbaugh
12/31/07